UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,978	09/05/2006	Kaneo Chiba	B-6122PCT 623712-6	9335
36716 LADAS & PAF	7590 08/12/201 RRY	EXAMINER		
	RE BOULEVARD, SU	CHOI, FRANK I		
LOS ANGELE	OS ANGELES, CA 90036-5679		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/12/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/591,978	CHIBA ET AL.			
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	FRANK CHOI	1616			
All Participants:	Status of Application: response after final action				
(1) <i>FRANK CHOI</i> .	(3)				
(2) <u>Mavis Gallenson</u> . (4)					
Date of Interview: 09 August 2011	Time: <u>5:00 pm</u>				
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:					
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed: See Continuation Sheet					
Claims discussed: Claim 3					
Prior art documents discussed: n/a					
Part II.					
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet					
Part III.					
 □ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. □ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 					
(A _j	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)			

Continuation of rejections discussed: Rejection of claim 4 for lack of antecedent basis - the range of less than 200 nm is broader in scope than the mean diamater of about 140 nm (std deviation of about 30 nm) in claim 3 as claim 4 encompasses size distributions other than about 140 nm plus or minus about 30 nm.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Rejection of claim 4 for lack of antecedent basis - the range of less than 200 nm is broader in scope than the mean diamater of about 140 nm (std deviation of about 30 nm) in claim 3 as claim 4 encompasses diameters which are greater and smaller than than about 140 nm plus or minus about 30 nm. The Examiner indicated that the language of claim 1 with respect to the inorganic shell and resulting inhibition of dissipation of the ozone nano-bubbles by said shell needed to be inserted into claim 3 in order to provide antecedent basis for the stopping of shrinking step in claim 4 and inhibition of diffusing in claim 5. The Applicant's representative indicated that she would have to discuss the issue with her client and that she would get back the examiner next week.